第４講　　長文総合問題②

次の英文を読み，(1)～(8)の設問について最も適切なものを選択肢①～④から選びなさい。

I want to see more good arguments in which logical and emotional elements fuse together. A good argument is like a well-written mathematical paper, as it has a fully watertight logical proof, but it also has a good explanation in which the ideas are sketched out [(1)] we humans can feel our way through the ideas as well as understand the logic step by step. A good discussion also addresses apparent inconsistencies in which the logic seemingly contradicts our intuition.

If we disagree with each other in an argument, the important first step is to find the true root of disagreement. We should do this by following long chains of logic on both sides of the argument. Next, we should build some sort of bridge between our different positions. We should use our ability to see things in the abstract to try and understand that we are really just at different parts of a gray area on the same principle. We should then engage our emotions to grasp where we are emotionally and try and edge slowly to where we all can meet.

I think a good argument, at root, is one in which our main aim is to understand everyone. How often is that actually the case? Unfortunately, most of the time, people argue with the goal of defeating others — most individuals are trying to prove that they are right and [(2)] is wrong. I don't think this is productive as a primary purpose. I used to be guilty of this as much as anyone, but I have come to realize that discussions really don't have to be

competitions. We must first grasp the obvious truth that it is not necessarily the case of one person being right and the other being wrong. Rather, when people disagree, it is often a reflection of differing (4) belief systems. Their opinions may contradict each other but they usually have their own internal logic. That said, this does not prevent people from holding inconsistent opinions within their own belief systems.

NOTE

Too many arguments turn into a cycle of attack and counterattack. In a good argument, however, nobody feels attacked. People don't feel threatened by a different opinion or a different point of view. All those participating in a given discussion should be responsible for creating this kind of safe environment. I tell myself as much as possible in any potentially divisive situation, "It's not a competition." And, [(3)], it almost never is a competition.

A good argument does invoke emotions, but not for intimidation or belittlement. It invokes emotions to make connections with people, to create a path for logic to enter people's hearts, not just their minds. This takes longer than throwing sarcastic comments at each other and trying to fire the "killer shot" that will end the discussion. Logic is slow and can fail us when we need to make a quick decision. When we are not in an emergency, however, we should have slow arguments. Unfortunately, the world tends to drive things faster and faster, with shorter and shorter attention spans meaning that we are under pressure to convince people in 280 letters, or in a brief comment accompanying an amusing picture, or in a clever one-liner — correct or otherwise — so someone can declare "mind = blown" or "mic drop." But this leaves little room for nuance or investigation, or for understanding how we agree and disagree. It leaves no time for building bridges.

NOTE

I would like us all to build bridges to connect us to people with whom we disagree. But what about people who don't want bridges? People who really want to disagree? Here we have a (6) <u>meta problem</u>. In other words, we first have to persuade people to want those bridges, before we have any hope at all of building them.

As humans in a community, our connections with each other are really all we have. If we were all hermits living in isolation, humanity would not have reached the place it has. Human connections are usually thought of as being emotional, and logic is usually thought of as being removed from emotions and thus removed from humanity. But I firmly believe that logic, used in conjunction with emotions, can help us build better and more compassionate connections between humans. And we must do it in a nuanced way. Black-and-white arguments cause division and extreme viewpoints. The division between logic and emotions, or that between different opinions, is artificial and misleading.

We should not place ourselves in futile battles against other humans with whom we are trying to coexist on this earth. And we should not let logic battle against emotions. A good argument is not a battle. It's not a competition. It's a collaborative art. With logic and emotions working together, we will achieve better thinking, and thus the greatest possible understanding of the world and of each other.

[The Art of Logic: How to Make Sense in a World that Doesn't, Eugenia Cheng, Profile Books, 2019]　　（20 慶應義塾大　商）

NOTE

(i) In the context of this passage, choose the most suitable expression to fill in each blank.

(1) The answer is: [(1)].

① aiming to　② resulting in　③ so that　④ such as

(2) The answer is: [(2)].

① most of them　② everyone else
③ other people　④ a few opponents

(3) The answer is: [(3)].

① in fact　② nevertheless
③ in case　④ what is worse

(ii) In the context of this passage, choose the best answer for each question.

(4) Which one of the following is in agreement with the author's thoughts regarding (4) belief systems? The answer is: [(4)].

① People's belief systems are inherently inconsistent
② Differences in belief systems are essential to reaching consensus
③ People can hold contradictory opinions within their own belief systems
④ Determining whose belief system is right is critical to a fruitful discussion

(5) In the fifth paragraph, the author makes all of the following points **EXCEPT**: [(5)].

① We live in a world that tends to prioritize speed over logical process

② Subtle details and implications are often neglected in a hasty discussion

③ Emotions can make the logic of a discussion more accessible to the listeners

④ Sophisticated logical arguments usually accelerate emergency management

(6) Which one of the following best describes the (6) meta problem referred to in the sixth paragraph? The answer is: [(6)].

① The question of whether we need bridges precedes that of how we build them

② The question of how to build bridges precedes that of whether we need them

③ Building a bridge benefits most people when its significance is unquestionable

④ Building a bridge benefits only a few people when its significance is questionable

(7) Which one of the following is consistent with the author's perspective on connecting people with different views? The answer is: [(7)].

① People who do not want to be bothered by others should be allowed to live in self-imposed isolation

② Emotions are not as useful as logic for cultivating connections with those with whom we disagree

③ The supposed "divisions" between people are often illusions that are formed by black-and-white thinking

④ Logic is about figuring out right versus wrong, not understanding many inconsistent viewpoints

(8) Which one of the following best summarizes the author's argument? The answer is: [(8)].

① Logic conceals the subtleties of our everyday experiences and pushes us towards resolutions

② Logic and emotions together help us understand the complexities of human reality and communicate effectively

③ If we prioritize logic over emotions, we can eliminate errors in a discussion between two opposing groups

④ Our discussions need to be firmly based on our own belief systems so that we are not incoherent or illogical

NOTE

大学別対策講座　慶應義塾大英語　復習テスト　第四回

次の見出し語と合致する日本語を４つの選択肢から１つ選びなさい。

１. fuse
① 絶滅させる　② 追放する　③ 遠慮する　④ 融合する

２. contradict
① 矛盾する　② 予言する　③ 指示する　④ 監督する

３. intuition
① 手配　② 削除　③ 直観　④ 常識

４. abstract
① 円滑な　② 具体的な　③ 抽象的な　④ 排他的な

５. inconsistent
① 一致する　② 固定された　③ 柔軟な　④ 矛盾した

６. invoke
① 呼び起こす　② 励ます　③ 落胆させる　④ 妨げる

７. sarcastic
① 立派な　② 優しい　③ 皮肉な　④ 率直な

８. hermit
① 伝説　② 従者　③ 隠者　④ 牧師

９. feel one's way
① 自分のやり方でやる　② 孤独を感じる
③ 意思疎通する　④ 手探りで進む

10. belief system
① 更新制度　② 信念体系
③ 年金制度　④ 福祉制度

NOTE

慶應義塾大英語　第４講　解答

< 解答 >

(i)　(1) ③　(2) ②　(3) ①

(ii)　(4) ③　(5) ④　(6) ①　(7) ③　(8) ②

< 問題と選択肢の訳 >

(i) 本文に合うように，それぞれの空所に最も適する表現を選びなさい。

(1) 解答は［ (1) ］。

① ～を狙って　② ～に終わって　**③ ～ように**　④ ～のような

(2) 解答は［ (2) ］。

① 彼らのほとんど　**② 他のみんな**

③ 他の人　④ 少数の敵対者

(3) 解答は［ (3) ］。

① 実際には　② それにもかかわらず

③ ～場合にそなえて　④ さらに悪いことに

(ii) 本文に合うように，それぞれの問題に最適な答えを選びなさい。

(4) 次のうち，著者の(4)信念体系に関する考えと合致するのはどれか。解答は［ (4) ］。

① 人々の信念体系は本来矛盾している

② 信念体系の違いは，意見が一致するのに不可欠だ

③ 人々は，自身の信念体系の中で，矛盾した意見を抱える可能性がある

④ 誰の信念体系が正しいかを決めるのは，実りのある議論のために必要だ

(5) 第５段落で，著者は［ (5) ］**を除いた**次の要点のすべてを述べている。

① 私たちは，論理的な過程よりもスピードを優先する傾向にある世界で暮らしている

② 微妙な詳細や暗示が，性急な議論では無視されることが多い

③ 感情によって，議論の筋道が，聞く側にとってより分かりやすくなることがある。

④ 洗練された論理的な議論は，たいていは緊急の処理を加速させる

(6) 次のうち，第６段落で言及された(6)より高度な問題を最も良く説明しているものはどれか。解答は［ (6) ］。

① 私たちが架け橋を必要とするかどうかという問題は，どうやってそれらを造るかという問題に先行する

② 架け橋を造る方法という問題は，私たちがそれらを必要とするかどうかという問題に先行する

③ 架け橋を造ることは，その重要性が疑いのないとき，ほとんどの人に恩恵を与える

④ 架け橋を造ることは，その重要性が疑わしいとき，ごくわずかの人にしか恩恵を与えない

(7) 次のうち，人を異なる意見と結び付けることに関する著者の見方と一致しているのはどれか。解答は［ (7) ］。

① 他人に悩まされたくない人は，自ら課した孤独の中で生きることが許されるべきだ

② 私たちが意見の合わない人との関係を深めるのに，感情は論理ほど役には立たない。

③ 人間同士の「区分」と思われているものは，黒か白かの考えによって形成されている幻想であることが多い。

④ 論理は，多くの矛盾する観点を理解することではなくて，正しいか間違っているかを理解することに関するものだ

(8) 次のうち，著者の主張をもっともよく要約したものはどれか。解答は［ (8) ］。

① 論理は，私たちの毎日の経験の微細な違いを隠して，私たちを解決の方へと押しやる

② 論理と感情が合わさることで，私たちは人間が持つ複雑さを理解し，効果的にコミュニケーションを取ることができる

③ もし私たちが感情より論理を優先するなら，２つの対立する集団間の議論の間違いをなくすことができる

④ 私たちの議論は，支離滅裂であったり非論理的であったりしないように，自分たちの信念体系にしっかりと基づいている必要がある

＜全訳＞

私は，論理的な要素と感情的な要素が一緒に混ざり合った良い議論をもっと見てみたい。良い議論とは，完全にすきのない論理的証明があるのでよく書かれた数学の論文のようだが，また私たち人間が，一歩一歩論理を理解するだけではなく，その考えを通じて，手探りで進めるように，その考えの概略を述べた良い説明がある。良い議論は，また一見すると論理が私たちの直観と相反するような外見上の矛盾にも取り組む。

もし私たちがある議論でお互いに意見が合わないなら，重要な最初のステップは，意見の不一致の本当の原因を見つけることだ。私たちは，その議論の両方の側の長い論理の鎖をたどって進むことで，これをすべきだ。次に，私たちは異なる立ち位置の間にある種の懸け橋を造るべきだ。私たちは，抽象的に物事を見る力を利用して，実際には同じ主義上にある，あいまいな領域の異なる部分にいるにすぎないことを理解しようとするべきだ。それから，私たちは自分の感情を使って，感情的な立ち位置を理解し，私たち全員が出会える場所にゆっくり少しずつ進もうとするべきだ。

良い議論とは，根本的に，私たちの主な目標がみんなを理解することにあるような議論だと，私は考える。それが，実際にはどの程度の頻度で当てはまるのか。残念ながら，ほとんどの場合，人々は相手を打ち負かすことを目標にして議論をする，すなわち，ほとんどの個人が自分たちは正しく，他のみんなが間違っていることを証明しようとする。私は，これが主要な目的としては生産的ではないと思う。私は，以前はみんなと同様にこの罪を犯していたが，議論は実際には必ずしも競争でなくてもよいと認識するようになった。私たちは，必ずしも一方の人が正しくて，他方の人が間違っているという事例ばかりではないという明らかな真理を理解しなければならない。むしろ，人の意見が異なるとき，異なる信念体系を反映したものであることが多い。彼らの意見は，お互いに相反するかもしれないが，たいていは彼ら自身の内部での論理性がある。たとえそうであっても，このために，人々が自分の信念体系の中で，矛盾した意見を持つことができないことはない。

あまりに多くの議論が，攻撃と反撃の応酬に転じてしまう。しかし，良い議論では，誰も攻撃されているとは感じない。人は，異なる意見や異なる観点によっ

て脅迫されているとは感じない。特定の議論に参加する人全員が，このような安全な環境を作るのに責任を持つべきだ。私は，いかなる不和が生じうる状況でも，できる限り自分に「これは競争ではない」と言い聞かせる。そして，実際に競争であることはほぼない。

良い議論では，実際に感情が呼び起こされるが，おどしたり，けなしたりすることに対するものではない。それは，人とつながりを作り，論理が人の頭だけではなく心に入る道を作るための感情を呼び起こす。このことは，お互いに皮肉な意見を言い合って，議論を終わらせる「決定打」を放とうとすることよりも時間がかかる。論理はゆっくりで，素早い決断をする必要があるとき，使えないことがある。しかし，緊急時でないときは，私たちはゆっくりと議論をすべきだ。残念ながら，世界は物事をどんどん速く進める傾向にあって，集中する時間がますます短くなり，誰かが「恐れ入りました」とか「一件落着」と宣言できるように，280 文字で，あるいは面白い絵文字付きの短いコメントで，はたまた正しかろうとそうでなかろうと気の利いた１行で人を説得するプレッシャーの下に置かれることになる。しかし，これは微妙な差異や調査，あるいは私たちがどのように賛成しているか反対しているかを理解する余地をほとんど残さない。懸け橋を造る時間がほとんど残らないのだ。

私は，私たち全員に，意見が異なる人と自分たちとをつなぐ架け橋を造ってもらいたい。しかし，架け橋を欲さない人はどうだろうか。本当に違う意見を持ちたい人は？　ここで，私たちは，より高度な問題にぶつかる。すなわち，私たちはそもそも架け橋を造る希望など抱く前に，まずは人々を説得してその架け橋を欲するようにし向けなければならない。

社会に属する人間として，お互いとの関係こそ，まさに私たちが持っているすべてなのだ。もし私たちみんなが，孤独に暮らす隠者なら，人類は今いる場所に到達できなかっただろう。人間のつながりは，たいていは感情的なものとみなされ，論理はたいていは感情から切り離されて，それゆえに人間性から切り離されているものとみなされている。しかし，私は論理が，感情と結び付いて使われたら，私たちが，人間同士のより良く，より思いやりにあふれた関係を築く助けになるとかたく信じている。そして，私たちはそれを微妙な方法で行わなければいけない。白か黒かの議論は，分断や極論を招いてしまう。論理と感情の区分や異なる意見の区分は，人為的で誤解を招くものだ。

私たちは，この地球上で共存しようとしている他の人間との無駄な戦いに，身を投じるべきではない。そして，私たちは論理を感情と戦わせてはいけない。良

い議論は戦いではない。それは競争ではない。それは共同作業の技術だ。論理と感情が共に働くことで，私たちはより良い考え方ができるようになり，それゆえに世界やお互いに対して，可能な限り最大の理解ができるようになるだろう。

第４講　重要語彙リスト

1	argument	議論	26	invoke	呼び起こす
2	fuse	融合する	27	intimidation	脅迫
3	watertight	すきのない	28	belittlement	けなすこと
4	sketch out	概略を述べる	29	sarcastic	皮肉な
5	feel one's way	手探りで進む	30	fire	～を浴びせる
6	step by step	一歩一歩	31	fail O	O の役に立たない
7	address	取り組む	32	emergency	緊急事態
8	inconsistency	矛盾	33	attention span	集中力が続く時間
9	seemingly	一見すると	34	brief	短い
10	contradict	相反する	35	accompany	～に伴う
11	intuition	直観	36	one-liner	1 行ジョーク
12	abstract	抽象的な	37	blown	（ヒューズなどが）とんだ
13	principle	主義	38	mic drop	マイクを落とす
14	engage	雇う	39	meta	より高度な
15	grasp	理解する	40	hermit	隠者
16	edge	じわじわ進む	41	isolation	孤独
17	at root	根本で	42	humanity	人類，人間性
18	defeat	打ち負かす	43	firmly	かたく
19	primary	主要な	44	compassionate	思いやりのある
20	reflection	反映	45	artificial	人為的な
21	belief system	信念体系	46	misleading	誤解を招く
22	turn into	～に変化する	47	futile	無駄な
23	counterattack	反撃	48	coexist	共存する
24	given	特定の	49	collaborative	共同作業の
25	divisive	対立を生む			

第４講　音読用白文　①　②　③　④　⑤　⑥　⑦　⑧　⑨　⑩

I want to see more good arguments in which logical and emotional elements fuse together. A good argument is like a well-written mathematical paper, as it has a fully watertight logical proof, but it also has a good explanation in which the ideas are sketched out so that we humans can feel our way through the ideas as well as understand the logic step by step. A good discussion also addresses apparent inconsistencies in which the logic seemingly contradicts our intuition.

If we disagree with each other in an argument, the important first step is to find the true root of disagreement. We should do this by following long chains of logic on both sides of the argument. Next, we should build some sort of bridge between our different positions. We should use our ability to see things in the abstract to try and understand that we are really just at different parts of a gray area on the same principle. We should then engage our emotions to grasp where we are emotionally and try and edge slowly to where we all can meet.

I think a good argument, at root, is one in which our main aim is to understand everyone. How often is that actually the case? Unfortunately, most of the time, people argue with the goal of defeating others — most individuals are trying to prove that they are right and everyone else is wrong. I don't think this is productive as a primary purpose. I used to be guilty of this as much as anyone, but I have come to realize that discussions really don't have to be competitions. We must first grasp the obvious truth that it is not necessarily the case of one person being right and the other being wrong. Rather, when people disagree, it is often a reflection of differing belief systems. Their opinions may contradict each other but they usually have their own internal logic. That said, this does not prevent people from holding inconsistent opinions within their own belief systems.

Too many arguments turn into a cycle of attack and counterattack. In a good argument, however, nobody feels attacked. People don't feel threatened by a different opinion or a different point of view. All those participating in a

given discussion should be responsible for creating this kind of safe environment. I tell myself as much as possible in any potentially divisive situation, “It’s not a competition.” And, in fact, it almost never is a competition.

A good argument does invoke emotions, but not for intimidation or belittlement. It invokes emotions to make connections with people, to create a path for logic to enter people’s hearts, not just their minds. This takes longer than throwing sarcastic comments at each other and trying to fire the “killer shot” that will end the discussion. Logic is slow and can fail us when we need to make a quick decision. When we are not in an emergency, however, we should have slow arguments. Unfortunately, the world tends to drive things faster and faster, with shorter and shorter attention spans meaning that we are under pressure to convince people in 280 letters, or in a brief comment accompanying an amusing picture, or in a clever one-liner — correct or otherwise — so someone can declare “mind = blown” or “mic drop.” But this leaves little room for nuance or investigation, or for understanding how we agree and disagree. It leaves no time for building bridges.

I would like us all to build bridges to connect us to people with whom we disagree. But what about people who don’t want bridges? People who really want to disagree? Here we have a meta problem. In other words, we first have to persuade people to want those bridges, before we have any hope at all of building them.

As humans in a community, our connections with each other are really all we have. If we were all hermits living in isolation, humanity would not have reached the place it has. Human connections are usually thought of as being emotional, and logic is usually thought of as being removed from emotions and thus removed from humanity. But I firmly believe that logic, used in conjunction with emotions, can help us build better and more compassionate connections between humans. And we must do it in a nuanced way. Black-and-white arguments cause division and extreme viewpoints. The division between logic and emotions, or that between different opinions, is artificial and misleading.

We should not place ourselves in futile battles against other humans with whom we are trying to coexist on this earth. And we should not let logic battle

against emotions. A good argument is not a battle. It's not a competition. It's a collaborative art. With logic and emotions working together, we will achieve better thinking, and thus the greatest possible understanding of the world and of each other.

復習テスト解答　第四回

1．④
2．①
3．③
4．③
5．④
6．①
7．③
8．③
9．④
10．②